

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. A Request for Appeal was filed in this application on March 20, 2007 and an Appeal Brief has yet to be filed and will not be filed in view of the present RCE filing. A one-month extension of time with requisite fee is being filed for pendency.

This Preliminary Amendment is accompanying an RCE filing of same date and is a duplicate of the After Final Amendment filed on January 22, 2007 except for the correction of the description for claim 13 noted by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of March 5, 2007. Thus, entry of the earlier filed After Final Amendment is not required in view of the present filing of this Preliminary Amendment.

Reference is made to the Remarks portion of the After Final Amendment of January 22, 2007 which are submitted to remain applicable to the claim set presented in this Preliminary Amendment and thus said Remarks are incorporated herein by reference.

In the Advisory Action of March 5, 2007, there is indicated the following:

... does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The locking means preclude movement of the reception chamber if the rod becomes bound to the chamber, adjustment is defined as bringing parts of to a true or more effective relative position, the reception chamber as disclosed and claimed is not adjustable. In addition the locking element 63 of Bertram would have to be sheared off for the reception chamber to move in response to a binding rod.

The above discussion is not entirely understood by Applicants. With respect to claim 1, the locking means is claimed as precluding a pull back of the reception chamber in an axial direction opposite the compression direction upon a binding of said rod with the fluid reception chamber. The prior art such as Bertram is considered by Applicants to be adjustable in a direction opposite to its compression direction upon a binding of the valve rod within its fluid reception chamber. The Bertram '905 arrangement is an example of the prior art suffering from adjustment in the axial direction opposite its compression direction when there is a binding arrangement between the rod and the fluid reception chamber. The Applicants consider there to be a sequence of events in an arrangement such as Bertram '905

involving, during use, a binding situation arising that is sufficient to overcome the compression forces wherein there is a pull back of the reception chamber together with the compression of the compressing means in a direction opposite the intended direction of compression for the compression means (e.g., the Belleville washer stack becomes compressed). At some point during the draw back against the compression means there is the possibility, at least in some binding situations, for the binding relationship to break off and allow the rod to reciprocate again in the reception chamber. This cycle can repeat until there is created the misalignment problem outlined in the background of the present application.

The indication in the Advisory Action that element 63 would need to be sheared off is not understood. A review of Figure 5 and the disclosure on column 8, lines 35-50 concerning press ring 63 indicates that the press ring 63 is designed to avoid tolerance deviations that may exist in the region of 52 in Figure 4 by providing a flat (metal) bearing face 60 against a corresponding flat (metal) bearing face 60 of fitting 55. This flat face to flat face metal contact, while involving metal-to-metal friction, would not involve a shearing force but rather a friction contact release force that can readily arise when considering the axial forces that can be generated when there is a binding relationship between the rod and reception chamber which rod is being driven, for example, by an electric motor via engagement with the rod's engagement end 20 shown in Figure 1 of Bertram '905.

With the above discussion, coupled with the earlier discussion in the After Final Amendment, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are currently in condition for allowance. If, however, the claims are not all deemed in condition for allowance, the Applicants request that an interview be granted to discuss the points raised by the Examiner in the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action quoted above.


In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable and that the application stands in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration at the Examiner's earliest convenience is thus respectfully requested.

If for any reason any fee is deemed required relative to this filing, authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4300 for such fee.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Dennis C. Rodgers  
Registration No. 32,936  
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: 202/263-4300  
Facsimile: 202/263-4329

Date: June 13, 2007